UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/647,777	12/29/2000	Hiroyuki Morimoto	2500.6	3913

5514 7590 04/29/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
TRAN, SUSAN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/647,777	MORIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan T. Tran	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 February 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *42-70* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *42-70* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

KD

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's Request for Continued Examination, Request for Extension of Time, and Preliminary Amendment filed 02/14/05.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/14/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. EP 0 650 826 A1, in view of Roche US 5,075,114.

Morimoto teaches a tablet compressing method using tabletting machine with lubricant spraying mean (see abstract). The method comprising spraying lubricant uniformly on the surface of an upper punch, a lower punch, and a die, filling the die with

pharmaceutical materials, and compressing the pharmaceutical material to form a drug tablet (columns 2-3 and columns 5-7).

Morimoto does not teach the specific form of pharmaceutical material being claimed, such as, coated granule or granule in a matrix base. Nonetheless, Morimoto teaches that his tabletting method can be used for tabletting many kinds of tablets such as powdered or granular medicine, and so on (column 7, lines 34-38).

Roche teaches a medicament tablet comprising granules coated with polymers blend (see abstract and column 2, lines 45-60). The resulting coated granules were then compressed into tablet form using tabletting machine having die wall and punches (columns 9-10). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the pharmaceutical materials to be tabletted in Morimoto using the coated drug granule in view of the teaching of Roche, because the references teach the use of compressed tabletting machine to compress pharmaceutical materials.

Claims 42-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsushima et al. US 6,036,974, in view of Roche US 5,075,114.

Tsushima teaches a method for preparation of tablet comprises preparing the tabletting material containing medicines and excipients, coating on the surface of the tabletting material a lubricant, coating the surface of the punches with lubricant, filling the die with the coated tabletting material, and compressing to obtain tablet (columns 2 and 6).

Tsushima does not teach the specific form of pharmaceutical material being claimed, such as, coated granule in a matrix base.

Roche teaches a medicament tablet comprising granules coated with polymers blend (see abstract and column 2, lines 45-60). The resulting coated granules were then compressed into tablet form using tabletting machine having die wall and punches (columns 9-10). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the tabletting materials of Tsushima using the coated drug granule in view of the teaching of Roche, because the references teach the use of compressed tabletting machine to compress pharmaceutical materials.

It is noted that the reference is silent as to the teaching of the percent amount of lubricant being coated onto the surface of the die and punches. However, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to, by routine experimentation determine a suitable amount of lubricant to obtain a smooth surface tablet. As well as the dividing line on the tablet, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, because dividing line, groove line, marking line, or scored tablet is well known in pharmaceutical art. Moreover, absent of evident on the contrary, the burden is shifted to applicant to

provide data showing the amount of surfactant uses by the cited references do not fall within the claimed range.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Morimoto nor Tsushima disclose use of granules including active substance covered with a coating film, or the granule including active substance in a base matrix. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Morimoto or Tsushima is cited in combination with Roche.

Applicant argues there is no motivation to combine Morimoto or Tsushima with Roche because it is not seen that there are any common technical problems sought to be addressed among the references. In response to applicant's argument, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Morimoto is relying on for the teaching that the tabletting method can be used for tabletting many kinds of tablets such as powdered or granular medicine, and so on (column 7, lines 34-38); and Tsushima is relying on for the teaching that the medicine can be filled in a small diameter seamless capsule (microcapsule) and then to mix this with wet powder before introduced into the mold. Accordingly, the "many kinds of tablets" materials such as microcapsule, powdered or granular medicine, and so on suggests the combination with Roche.

Applicant argues that the examiner has disregarded the discussion of the unexpected results submitted by applicant's specification. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner in the final rejection had fully considered the data from table 2 submitted by applicant. However, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish unexpected results over the cited references. Applicant states that the tablet achieved by the present invention is superior in its rapid disintegrability comparing to the tablets described in the cited references. However, table 2 of applicant's specification at page 50 discloses disintegration time of the claimed tablet is 6.0 minute comparing to the

comparison example of 10.2 minutes. Applicant's attention is called to the cited references, for example, Tsushima at table 2, column 10, discloses a disintegration time of 0.6 minutes. Applicant also states that table 3 of applicant's specification shows that the tablet of the claimed invention is harder than the tablet of Roche and Morimoto at the same pressure. However, it is noted that the tablet hardness, as well as the specific tabletting pressure as disclosed in tablet 3 are not require in the claims. applicant also argues that tables 4 and 5 of the specification show unexpected sustained release profile compared to Morimoto's. However, the sustained release profile is not being claimed.

Conclusion

This is an RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/647,777. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-0606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page, can be reached at (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

THURMAN K PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600